

## **REMARKS**

Claims 18-26, 28-30, 36 and 38 are pending. Claim 18 has been amended. Claims 19-23, 26 and 28-30 are original. Claims 1-17, 27, 31-35 and 37 have been canceled without prejudice. Claims 24-25, 36 and 38 have been previously presented. No new matter has been introduced by the amendment.

### **1. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 18-26, 28-30, 36 and 38 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Murai et al. (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2005/0213005) in view of Matsushita et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6885418). The Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections based on the following arguments.

Murai describes a transfective liquid crystal device in which an upper-layer insulating film 7a on the thin film transistor 30 (a first passivation layer on the thin film transistor) has an unevenness pattern 8g (protrusions) (see paragraph 68, lines 4-13). The unevenness pattern 8g, however, is formed due to the unevenness forming layer 13a (see paragraph 68, lines 8-13). In other words, the protrusions (the unevenness pattern 8g) are not formed by patterning the first passivation layer on the thin film transistor (the upper-layer insulating film 7a on the thin film transistor 30). Matsushita does not teach or suggest altering Murai such that the protrusions are formed by patterning the first passivation layer on the thin film transistor.

In contrast, the fabricating method of a transfective liquid crystal display device as recited in amended independent claim 18 comprises forming a first passivation layer on the thin film transistor, the first passivation layer having at least one protrusion in the reflective portion, wherein the at least one protrusion is formed by patterning the first passivation layer. Support for amended independent claim 18 can be found in Applicants' specification, for example, in paragraph 59, lines 4-9.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, the Applicants respectfully submit that Murai in view of Matsushita does not teach or suggest all the limitations as recited in amended independent claim 18, and thus a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established (see MPEP 2143). Accordingly, the rejections against amended independent claim 18, and thus the rejections against claims 19-26, 28-30, 36 and 38, which all depend from amended independent claim 18, have been overcome and should be withdrawn.

## **2. Conclusion**

Based on the above amendments and remarks, the Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance. The examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned attorney to expedite allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 1, 2007

/Gustavo Siller, Jr./

Gustavo Siller, Jr.

Registration No. 32,305

Attorney for Applicants

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE

P.O. BOX 10395

CHICAGO, IL 60610

(312) 321-4200